



COPY OF PAPERS
ORIGINALLY FILED

Patent
Attorney's Docket No. 000515-175

9/Response
n.s.

72
6-4

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of) **Box: After Final**
Ulla Olofsson et al.) Group Art Unit: 3761
Application No.: 09/446,395) Examiner: WEBB, J.
Filed: December 22, 1999)
For: LIQUID-PERMEABLE COVER)
SHEET FOR ABSORBENT ARTICLE)

RECEIVED
MAY -3 2002
TC 3700 MAIL ROOM

AMENDMENT/RESPONSE

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

In response to the final Office Action mailed on February 8, 2002, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1-11 are pending in the present application.

The specification was objected to and claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The specification was objected to and the claims rejected due to the use of the term "oxygen/carbon ratio." According to the Office Action, the specification fails to disclose what the ratio is of and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be able to determine whether the ratio is a weight, volume, atomic or molar ratio without undue experimentation. Applicants disagree. One of ordinary skill would know that the oxygen/carbon ratio is an atomic ratio since the ratio is the result of the performance of electron spectroscopic chemical analysis. ESCA involves the measurement of the binding energy of emitted electrons, the results of which is given in the form of